

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

NOTES of the meeting held on Thursday, April 18, 1991

- Present:** C.L. Bertrand; M. Yates; B. Harris; S. Ruby; F. Stevens; C. White; J. Lightstone; J. Appleby; M. Brian; E. Preston; W. Knitter; G. Auchinachie; M. Verthuy; R. Kilgour; M. Barlow; G. Sassano; G. Decarie; H. Shulman; J. Locke; W. Byers; A. Teffeteller; C. Gray; M. Poirier; N. Segalowitz; M. Oppenheim; M. Taylor; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; J. Snyder; J. Serruya.
- Regrets:** P. Albert; Z. Hamlet; M. Armstrong.
- Absent:** M. Szabo; T. Swift; J. Gavin; P. Widden; G. Kanaan; B. Lewis; D. Shapiro; G. Fisher; H. McQueen; R. Perigoe; M. Shames; R. Sharma; G. Newsham; C. Potworowski; S. Lanthier-O'Connor; G. Bastien; E. Budik; K. Clément; L. Cohen; H. Danakas; J. Drolet; S. Farber; R. Gotlieb; G. Grougrou; J. Gruman; E. Kalantar; B. Leonhardt; P. Richards; T. Taylor.
- Guests:** D. Sheps; E. Pechter; M. Brian; S. Spurvey.

Dean Bertrand opened the meeting at 2:06 by stating that Council would go into a "Committee of the Whole".

TRANSCRIPT OF DISCUSSIONS HELD IN A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

**DEAN BERTRAND:** There has been, as I imagine the majority of you are aware, some discussion in the University in recent weeks about strategic planning in regard to space allocation as a result of the new library building on the downtown campus, the new library building on the Loyola campus, the purchase of the Loyola High School and a number of other factors that we're taking into consideration. Steering Committee, in its meeting last week in preparation for this meeting, wanted to have a debate structured around the academic implications of

consolidation of Departments, without regard to location of Departments but simply the academic implications involved in the idea of consolidation. Also, as you can see from your agenda, in regard to specific issues around consolidation and what they will mean for the vision of the Faculty of Arts and Science - the curriculum (both disciplinary and interdisciplinary), library and research facilities, and graduate and undergraduate instruction. In that context I will be pleased to open the floor to members of Council who wish to speak on these issues.

DR. DECARIE: I just want to throw one suggestion forward. It seems strange that it hasn't been debated because we find ourselves in a position of discussing the implications of merging Departments without having made clear what educational value that has. There is a merger which could occur with no implications for the library or for education at all. It would save us an enormous amount of space and presumably a good deal of money. Why have we not thought of merging the administration? It would appear to me that there are excellent facilities out here for them. I don't understand why they operate on a two-campus basis.

DR. KNITTER: I'd like to speak on one aspect of the report. We seem to have a practice in this province which is paralleled in this university - if we get the principles straight, then we can deduce all else. This is an impossible task. If you wanted to know whether consolidation would be a good thing, you could only decide that in relation to certain Departments in certain locations. For example, the collegiality that results from the chance encounters in the Vanier Library seems all to the good. But that had as much to do with the actual space layout, the way people interact and talk to one another. The building is designed to promote it. If in a consolidation everyone is apart from everyone else because of the nature of the building there will be no collegiality. So in fact it's difficult to talk about these principles without relating them to anything else. But that only begins to set the stage for then beginning to talk about, under what circumstances, for what Departments, might consolidation make sense.

PROF. BRIAN: I would like to make a comment, particularly about Principle #2, which is the consolidation principle. I really don't understand the principle. Does it imply more synergy? To give you some thoughts as to how I see this affecting part-time students. (The Rector has told us everything begins with students - I would like to begin with students). I'm concerned particularly with the part-time student for whose academic survival it is necessary to get to a library at lunch or in the hour before class because that student works downtown. Or the west-end student who gets her kiddies off to school first thing in the morning and comes in here and gets an hour's work done before her 10:15 class. Now if library holdings for these particular students are on the other campus the student's hour in the library has been reduced to 15 or 20 minutes - unless we find an amazing new way of shuttling people between the two campuses. I want to speak also about new students. I think the location is far more important for them than for the continuing student. Students have to see what goes on - and plenty of students from downtown will drop into a 6:05 lecture and after a year or two they will get hooked. And at that point, they might come out to Loyola. But I think we're cutting off a big chunk of our enrolment and this seems to be borne out by a survey in '83 that was done on moving to Loyola. It does seem to me that we're losing a lot of potential students. On the subject of women I would like

to point out, in decreasing the ratio of women downtown what sort of message that is sending to the women downtown. Certainly it seems to be the message: don't consider a career in academia because there are going to be fewer and fewer female faculty downtown also. I'm also concerned about the message that it conveys to the female student at Loyola who perceives downtown as being business, engineering, the real world - the male dominated world. Where do they fit in? My grave concern is for interdisciplinarity. I know that discussions are taking place which would legislate a certain measure of interdisciplinarity, but I'm a great proponent of fortuitous encounters. The Anthropology student who finds himself having lunch with the student in Biology. The Physics student who picks up a Philosophy textbook in the bookstore. The chance to get away from a class and go to a public lecture being held on a topic of interest. As a student I could get away from my Biology lab and go and listen to Marshall McLuhan. But if Marshall McLuhan had been out at a campus several miles from the downtown campus at the University of Toronto I would not have been able to get to it. I feel that the Strategic Space Committee is proposing to dismember what I consider to be the heart of the University, that is, Arts and Science - and in so doing, is going to seriously undermine the effectiveness of the University. Another Dean, another century - asked For Whom the Bell Tolls. Well it seems to me that the bell is tolling right now. It's tolling for the survival of the university, interdisciplinarity, for the continued attraction and serving of new students for whom the location is important. If we were able to make resolutions I would like to request that no action be taken on the initial report, and an alternative scenario be created in which maintaining functions on both campuses was taken as principle and a cost benefit analysis of a second scenario be undertaken and then with wide consultation let us make a decision.

DEAN BERTRAND: Could you just for my edification and perhaps members of Council tell me on what principle you would base the maintenance of two-campus operations in only certain disciplines?

PROF. BRIAN: Principal 2 says that the system works best whenever possible activities, groups, are organized in such a way that provides a synergy among faculty and maximum access to students. The *Thursday Report* gives a scenario of certain Departments being fully housed on one campus. It's Principle 2, but also the scenario attached to it, which does suggest that the thrust is to try to gather a particular discipline on a particular campus and I'm saying that this is a loss for interdisciplinarity. Those Departments which do have a critical mass of students, faculty and library holdings should be encouraged to maintain a presence on both campuses for incoming students.

DEAN BERTRAND: So if I understand you correctly, the principle upon which you base the idea of the retention of only certain Departments being divided between the campuses is "interdisciplinarity"? Is that correct?

PROF. BRIAN: Yes - and accessibility.

DEAN BERTRAND: We have a guest representative from Etudes françaises today. Unfortunately Claude Levy, the regular representative, is ill. We all send him our best wishes

for a speedy recovery. Mair Verthuy has graciously agreed to sit in for Prof. Levy.

**PROFESSOR VERTHUY:** I think that one of the elements that has been bothering me since the beginning of this pseudo-discussion, (I don't mean here today, I say pseudo-discussion because in fact no discussion has taken place with anyone in the decision making process of the Strategic Space Plan), is what I perceive to be a lack of leadership from my Dean. And I think any discussion about the future of this University should include all the components in it - the students, the support staff, the professional staff, the faculty and even (and you see how generous I can be on occasion) the administration. But I do think it should involve everybody. And I do think that the appropriate place to initiate some grass-roots discussion of any space plans that affect the Departments in Arts and Science would have better come from you. I'm not suggesting that it's your fault that they didn't, but they didn't and I think that's been a major problem. I think they should have come from the Dean. I think they should have gone to Departments, to Student Associations, and to everyone involved. And I think there would have then been a sense that we were being consulted. As it is, we the faculty, have been bypassed, the students have been bypassed, the staff has been by-passed, the professional staff has been bypassed, by a committee that was struck in secret presumably by the Rector (although it's hard to know, since we don't know anything about it).

**DEAN BERTRAND:** Well, I can clarify that particular point. And while I do not wish in a Committee of the Whole to circumscribe discussion, I will remind you that the agenda for today's meeting is on the academic implications of the principles in the document and not on concern about how or why the document was generated. And so it is a bit out of order to talk about the past process. First of all, it was Vice-Rector Giguère (the V/R, Services) -ultimately the person in charge of space and space allocation - who struck the committee, not the Rector. My understanding is the Rector himself didn't know that the committee had been struck - just to make that clear. Also, I just want to point out to you that as an historian I can confidently say, what's past is past - and Steering Committee did not feel it would do us any particular good to bemoan what may or may not have been a good procedure but rather, to look at, in a positive sense, what Arts and Science as a Faculty wants to say to the Vice-Rector Services, to the Rector, to anybody else, about space planning for the future.

**PROFESSOR VERTHUY:** Then I'm happy to hear that. I certainly don't want to go on bemoaning the past. But I do think then that we do need more leadership from the Dean and we need more involvement of the Departments and not merely in an extraordinary committee meeting of the whole - of the Arts and Science Faculty Council. I also think that if we're to develop a vision for the Faculty of Arts and Science that is in any way new or different from the vision that I thought was carrying us on quite nicely - we need the information in order to develop that. And so far, the information that presumably was provided to the Strategic Space Planning Committee has not been provided to Departments, to students, or to staff. And so it's very hard - we're asked to provide alternative scenarios and we have not been given the possibility of providing them because we don't have the necessary data. So I think that's important - that we need time, and we need the data. And we need to have all the constituted



groups of the Faculty of Arts and Science - each Department, the Student Associations, each staff and professional staff association, if they impinge on our work - to be involved with all the data at hand in developing different scenarios. I'd like to reiterate what Professor Brian said - that it's important to cultivate interdisciplinarity, that the university not be cut up into slices. I have (and I wish he were here to hear it because I'm sure he would faint) memories of Russell Breen making statements about Arts and Science being the heart of any university - and I'm nostalgic for Russell Breen - this would have made him faint. Because he understood what the university is about and there is no sign that the Space Committee understands what a university is about. So I think that we, as members of the Faculty of Arts and Science, have to say very strongly that we are the university. That yes, Engineering is part of the university, and Commerce and Administration - but that the university is the Faculty of Arts and Science - either in one location or in two locations - we are the heart of the university. And you don't remove the heart from the body (other than in some monstrous scientific project) and expect the body to function properly. So we need to be together. We need, I think, the access. I see no reason (and certainly no one has given me any data to prove the contrary) why we shouldn't operate a two campus operation. We've got two different kinds of people coming to the university. We have the west-end clientele, we have the downtown, north and east-end clientele, and a south-shore clientele - and for many of these people the downtown campus is the obvious one. We have a steady clientele in the French Department on the Loyola campus - but it's a small one. And when we schedule classes every two years - many of our classes that are scheduled every two years on the Loyola campus do not attract many students. They attract the steady Loyola campus students, which is good. But the downtown students wait. They go elsewhere - they go to another Department, they go to another course, they take a year off, - but they wait until the courses are available to them because it means extra travelling time, because it's not convenient, because it's unpleasant in the evening (particularly, but not exclusively, I presume, for women students). We had an example two weeks ago on the Loyola campus of a woman being attacked in the sports complex. And there are all these issues involved. Also, both in the French Department and in the Simone de Beauvoir Institute of which I'm also a member, although I don't represent it here today - half our students come from Fine Arts - in the literature courses, and in a lot of the language courses, and in some of the translations courses, (this is true of the English Department, I'm sure), there is interdisciplinarity already. We may not have interdisciplinary programs with Fine Arts - we just have Fine Arts students (thank you very much) and this is interdisciplinarity working in its own way. The students come in, bring their expertise into my classes in both these disciplines and I'm sure in other disciplines, and we won't become interdisciplinary if we move Arts away from half its clientele. We'll be killing the Arts too if we move them away from UQAM and McGill - I think possibly UQAM in particular - because there is a growing exchange of students between the two campuses and certainly growing mutual resources. So I think that in attempting to redefine what Arts and Science should be, I think we should make it clear that we are the university. I think we should make it clear that the administration and administrative offices of the university are not here to make decisions that affect academic planning but that it's the academics, the faculty and students who decide what academic planning they want. And they should then request the administrative services to provide the planning. Right now we've got the tail wagging the dog - a very unhappy dog. Once again, as I pointed out in a letter to the Vice Rector, for the Arts to be moved out

to the west-end, could only give the impression that the Anglophone community is withdrawing from the multi-cultural, multilingual, French-speaking downtown and this is not the time (I don't think any time is the time) for us to be doing that. But I think that right now, this is particularly not the time for us to be doing that - I think we'll send the wrong message out across Quebec. And we don't need that - we have to affirm our presence downtown. The Arts and Social Sciences are very heavily involved with the public. This is what we do, and we have to make our presence felt as Departments in an English-speaking university in downtown Montreal. Thank you.

DEAN BERTRAND: May I just ask you to clarify one point for the edification of the Dean and the Council members. As I understood what was said, you're not opposed to the principle of consolidation - you just happen to think that Arts and Science should be consolidated downtown. Is that right?

PROFESSOR VERTHUY: No, I never said that. I said we have a natural clientele at Loyola and we have a natural clientele downtown and both clienteles should be served the way they have been traditionally served. I'll refer you also to the concept of a shopping mall. In any shopping mall you do not find one large department store - you always find several because they feed each other. No one builds a large department store in isolation from other department stores - it's bad trade. And we need to be close (part of the faculty of Arts and Science) to the other faculties so we can feed each other as we have been doing.

DEAN BERTRAND: Then, for my edification again, and members of Council, just so I can get a sense of what it is I think I understand - are you then advocating that we split all those currently consolidated Departments and put part of them on each campus?

PROFESSOR VERTHUY: I would reiterate what I said several times at the beginning which is that it's very difficult for us to develop a vision of Arts and Science without the information that the Strategic Space Planning Committee has. So that it may be appropriate in some cases to have a one-campus operation. And if that's appropriate, then that's fine. If it functions for some Departments - good. But if it doesn't function for other Departments then it shouldn't be imposed upon them.

DEAN BERTRAND: Thank you. I just want to clear up two points that you raised. It is my understanding (and I hope that it's going on in each of the Departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science) that some have begun discussions on these issues and I presume that at a certain point I will hear from those Departments on their views of space, space planning and the academic implications. So I do think it's happening at the grass roots level in that sense. I just don't know how wide spread it is yet at this time. And the other thing I'd just like to correct - because I heard this before - there was indeed an unfortunate incident where someone attempted to get into the womens' locker room in the sports complex and had a camera and was taking pictures of women in the showers - and I deplore that, as I know all of you do. At the same time, the only attacks on women on this campus have been "date rapes" (as they're called) in the dormitories. Whereas on the downtown campus there have been a number of attacks on

women in the Hall Building and in the Annexes, not to mention one of the most dangerous metros, Lucien L'Allier. So I'd just like to make everybody aware that I don't think women should feel particularly safe downtown any more than they would feel particularly safe on the Loyola campus.

PROF. SHULMAN: Part of the problem we have is trying to get some abstract conceptual notion of how the academic mission or the academic endeavour is accomplished. In many instances we already have consolidation within the Departments and Colleges. Many of us operate happily and coherently on one campus or the other. I think when we have some kind of master plan that emerges with the principle that says something of consolidation, it doesn't have the requirement as a discernment to distinguish those areas where coherence and collegiality is best enhanced through a one-campus operation and those where a service to the university is going to be detrimental by true consolidation. So when you have a small Department or a College which has a particular tradition of servicing the community from one campus to the other and it works well - why bother changing it unless there is a very pressing reason to do so. That might be Geology on Loyola campus, that might be Liberal Arts College downtown. On the other hand, there are large units which are important to the functioning of Concordia University regardless of campus: History, Mathematics, French, English, Political Science, Sociology. The Departments are very large and have a coherence and collegiality within the Department - sometimes more on one campus than on the other. And I think the nature of what the university has to offer and Arts and Science demands, is that both types of operations exist - consolidation on one hand and some kind of two campus operation on the other. And if you asked me that question - do I support the two campus operation in principle - I would say in part it has to do with size. In part it has to do with how important that unit is in servicing the larger university so that we teach English grammar and French grammar, we teach Mathematics and Literacy. Those are so basic to the education of so many students that it strikes me as not a good idea pedagogically or in terms of use of our resources to try to consolidate. I think that the character of a campus will not be serviced by a principle, or consolidation, that doesn't take into consideration other realities. One of the things that concerns me greatly in this debate and some of the great anger that has emerged over the last few weeks in this university is that one of the principles enunciated as important in the space report -that of collegiality -might be irretrievably lost. I think that the notion that one can bring people from one unit to another without consultation, without consideration of the academic purpose of that unit and therefore increase the productive operation of that Department or college or unit or whatever - I think is a mistake. I find no use in entering into a debate and saying who should occupy what property -a mistake that goes back to real estate concerns - perhaps things would be better served if there was a space surplus on one campus and a space deprivation on the other. It seems to be logical that there are units that seem to be unhappy or not able to service the larger university under the present set-up. And it strikes me as sensible to see if the space needs and the needs of the different units could have been brought to bear in a way that accentuated the....well - brought resources where there was space. It strikes me that in some Departments they'd be very happy to move into other space, other areas where there is space availability. And I think that some coordination and some sensibility to the academic mission where things don't just get dispersed, where every unit decides where they're going to be. There has to be some type of larger



coordination because I think something could be done on a much more modest scale with much less exacerbation. And I think it would much better serve the university as a whole. So my conclusion is this: I think that any large master plan which tries to allocate space based on some grand acts of consolidation versus some other principle - is a mistake. I think its better to focus on the areas that need the space and try to find space for them, consistent with the larger academic mission. I think that there has to be some determination that the nature of the university demands that certain services be provided on both campuses, not simply a place where you teach a course but as a place where you have an office and a coherency and cohesion within. And at the same time that I'm saying that - I would not go along with the notion that it is necessary to have at all times premium quality in the Department that we have. Some of this can exist on a smaller basis on one campus and some on a larger basis on the other campus. I also think that in a university that is very strapped for funds that it is not necessary to assume that a two campus operation means that you're going to be able to use equal resources. For example, I've heard it mentioned before (and I don't know what the reality is) but if in fact you order journals on two campuses it just services the fact that you have to serve both campuses - I think those are areas of legitimate concern because those monies have to be used in such a way to maximize holdings and allow people to travel between campuses for purposes of doing some of their research. The implications should exist equally at all levels throughout the whole process.

MR. J. SERRUYA: As students we are very displeased at the way the Strategic Space Plan was presented and organized, and with the timing of it. One of our major grievances is, of course, that students and the Students' Associations were not consulted. However I'll try to limit my comments to the academic implications. As mentioned before, the major academic implications as far as we see it - concern interdisciplinarity - where we think consolidation would hinder and would breed a very narrow education. We don't think that many students (and this has been confirmed actually by the survey made by the Commerce Students' Association) would bother to go to another campus to attend a course which is not in their Faculty. If their Faculty or their Department was consolidated, let's say, downtown, they would not bother to come to Loyola to attend another course. And of course, concerning accessibility, I think it would impair the education of future students and of course, part-time students. I'd like to ask you a question - and that is: Since everyone here would of course agree that there are incredible academic implications of the Space Plan (and this is also one of recommendations in CUSA's reply to the Space Plan), will the final proposal be debated here at Faculty Council and/or at Senate so that we can make specific recommendations or change it?

DEAN BERTRAND: You're asking me? I'm the wrong person to ask. I don't know the answer to that question. It probably depends on what you mean. If you mean a debate similar to the one we are having now about the academic implications of certain principles involved in the Strategic Space Plan that may well go to Faculty Council. It's happening here, as far as I'm concerned, in this particular Faculty Council today and it may well go to the Senate. If you're talking about the specifics of what finally would happen with a space plan - whether it be the status quo (which I've heard some people more or less argue for today) or whether it would be a variety of changes - I doubt very much whether that would come to Faculty Council or to Senate



because that's less an academic issue than the principles. That would have to be established and agreed upon before those particular moves were made. The real place to raise that question, is probably the next Senate meeting - in terms of the person more qualified than I to speak on whatever is in his mind about the process. That would be my reaction off the top of my head.

DR. AUCHINACHIE: I must confess that I find it hard to conform to the parameters of the discussion - which are to be the academic implications of...I know that a number of speakers have made the same point from idealism and pragmatism to dogs and tails, from proactive to reactive, from the abstract to the particular. I think many of us have this strong suspicion that the academic justification was cobbled-up after the fact - encouraged even by your opening remarks, which were about buildings rather than about academic implications. That is, we are to quarrel with what is essentially rationalization of the material constraint of space. And we are to contradict this rationalization on purely academic grounds - that we actually don't have too much information about space (and I think at the previous meeting we were told that even if we did, we probably couldn't understand it...implications) But to proceed on the parameters, I hope we'll all get a chance to speak again. There's so much to say. I would reiterate that the students are massively opposed to this. That is, there have been petitions (in English approximately 1,300 students, in Sociology 485, History 421, French 510) That's about 2,700 students who have serious reservations about the relocation of their Departments to the single place. This means that, if this is an academic implication, we are seriously tampering with our enrolment. If I may speak of English it is our experience that in the English Department downtown the enrolment for courses at the Sir George half generally takes place before the Loyola courses. If the Loyola courses fill up, they fill up at the end of registration when all the Sir George sections are gone. It does seem, by and large, to be the preferred place. But do not take this argument to mean that I think that Loyola should not continue to exist. It is a tolerably successful operation. I do think the effect of collegiality, of forcing Sir George people to come to Loyola with a cobbled-up academic justification is not going to enhance collegiality - far from it. It will enhance (at least for the time being) enmity. I don't know why if we had all the academic justifications in the world or all the scenarios to think about - if we wanted to promote a reason for there being a Loyola campus and a reason for there being a Sir George one and we were told that there wasn't an efficient one - we could have actually decided to have different programs. Slightly different versions of English as Glendon and Atkinson have at York. We weren't asked to be this imaginative. We were told only after the fact (and it does seem to us a cobbled up explanation) that there is a lack of collegiality. Who says? Was collegiality tested? Did you tell us five years down...beforehand - that we should be improving our collegiality. No, on one said there was a problem with collegiality - but this move is going to foster collegiality which strikes me as a cynical, cobbled together reason. If it fosters interdisciplinarity, well maybe. I'm not going to rehearse the history of interdisciplinarity - but it hasn't been conspicuously successful at Concordia. The previous calendars are littered with interdisciplinary failures in the past. I suspect interdisciplinarity is the latest buzzword among higher administrators. I read from the University of Victoria alumni magazine that the president of the University of Victoria thinks that where its at is between the cracks in the sidewalk, or some such god-awful metaphor - that this is where its happening. Well we thought in our innocence that it was actually happening in

central disciplines. There seemed to be quite a lot of ferment in English - that it was an exciting enough discipline without a shotgun marriage with some other partner. If you want further academic justifications, the graduate program in English is heavily at Sir George. It happens to be one of the largest M.A. programs in Canada - I think in part because it has something comparatively rare, a Creative Writing aspect. But it also is accessible to part-time students. We have tried graduate courses out at Loyola taught by our most popular teachers. The students do not come. The transportation system isn't suitable. So massively our graduate program is downtown. A move to Loyola, a consolidation on Loyola campus, would massively affect enrolment. As for library and research facilities, well we can all guess. The Space Planning Committee didn't make any remarks about that. Some of the librarians at the Thursday hearing admitted that they knew nothing of it. No one has said this is how these holdings will be physically accommodated. So if you would support the idea of distributing all the information to all Departments for us to have informed input into whatever is going to be decided. I think as a Chair of a Department I can't be alone in being somewhat resentful that all the while there was a massively alternative plan being hatched while I was looking (and others) at the space that we were to have in the new library. If you think this isn't an academic matter - it does affect morale. We have, downtown in the English Department, been expecting new quarters for years. We have gone from pillar to post and that dignifies our quarters. Places where people pissed in the elevator (they were caught short off the street). Things with incendiary fire cases. We are in the Norris Building, which is estimably grungy and we thought we were going into something which had at last been designed for us. But unfortunately we don't have massive machinery, and therefore, quote, unquote, "no special needs". Instead, if the Space Committee is accurate we have the prospect again of cobbled up quarters. English Departments are apparently like registration, which never takes place in space actually designed for it. It's an arena or a cafeteria, or an old apartment block. So I think that.. morale is part of an academic response. It is going to be a defect of this plan. No one has told us if we'll inherit mass vacated space - we'll go into the Centennial Building or something in the Loyola High School Building which is being cobbled-up for us.

DEAN BERTRAND: You asked me a question? I'm not quite certain...

DR. AUCHINACHIE: Well, we are aware that we have very little information about space and where we're likely to go. We're wondering if you have any superior information. Apparently you knew before us that this plan was in the offing. Perhaps you have information that you can share with us and help us to prepare our future. I mean, you say: lets have space committees in the Departments but these space committees should be prepared for all contingencies. Should they simply abstractly declare that an English Department with this number of graduate students and this number of books, faculty, undergraduate students etc., deserves this much space. After all, when we inspected the space for the new library something like norms were being observed. That is, at last we could get the space that our graduate students deserved by virtue of being graduate students. Will we be able to demand that in any new space given us or will we simply have to accept the quarters that happen to be physically there?

DEAN BERTRAND: The answer to your first question is that I am no more aware than you because there are no plans beyond what you have read here. And in fact you can take the scenario out. Had anyone asked me my advice way back when, I would have said don't put any scenario in - let's go with the principles and strategies and see how people react. And that's what I'm talking about when I say that Departments are meeting to discuss those issues. It's premature at this point to worry about where precisely the location of the English Department will be. But one thing I can assure you, is that you will get space according to government norms. That I can assure you now and that you will be consulted every step of the way in putting together whatever it is that ends up as the location or the locations of the Departments or Departments of English at Concordia University. And that's why I don't think Departments should get particularly concerned about that right now, but rather concerned about building academic explanations for whatever they want to say is the position of the Department. As I understood you, and you can clarify this for my edification and that of Council, you are in opposition to some other speakers today in that you see that the two campus operations of certain Departments have led to a disinterest in and in fact a loss of a number of inter-disciplinary programs.

DR. AUCHINACHIE: No. I said that the calendar has interdisciplinary programs in them that have actually fallen into disuse. One wonders why interdisciplinary surfaces every once in awhile as an idea. How did it get into the heads of the Space Committee? Is it the latest buzz idea? It is a real question. Why is it there?

DEAN BERTRAND: So you did answer my question. There are two opposing views on whether or not two campus operations have to do with interdisciplinary programmes.

DR. KNITTER: I'd like to reassert a principle that should be involved in the operation. The Hippocratic Oath - first of all could do no harm. And that's a principle that has been considerably violated to this point. It's no good debating abstract principles. Abstract principles always get put in place in respect to some matter or some particular area. And those matters and particular areas often come to have greater weight in the meaning of the events than the abstract principles. If you move people by force kicking and screaming for the sake of some supposed benefits of consolidation, the effect on real collegiality and real productivity in relationship with students and scholarship will be far worse for years. It seems to me if we want to talk about consolidation it must be only in relation to particular Departments - where those Departments feel they have a stake in it and have a position where they can improve particular programs. So it continues to disturb me - in answer to the student's question as to whether we would be able to debate any final plans, he was certain that we would only be able again to talk about the principles. When you get this principle talk - an analogy from bridge. The poor beginning bridge player will defend a bad move by saying: But isn't it a rule - two opening hands go to game? Well if you match, if you have experience, if you're good bridge players sometimes yes, sometimes no. Steven Toulmin, in The Return from Cosmopolis, remarks on the re-emergence of the ancient principles of the locale, the particular, the timely and the concrete. These things matter in how events work often much more than the universal and the abstract and the eternal. And persisting in the discussion of the search for principles which might be embedded abstractly and then used only in application, I think ensures much unhappiness down the road.



DR. SEGALOWITZ: I thought I'd say something about what our Department has been doing on this issue. We had two meetings so far and at these meetings we discussed how we thought the 9 published principles could affect us if they were put into practice. We generated another 6 principles that reflect our priorities and we've talked about a number of major concerns, mostly issues of fact that we wanted to bring to the attention of anybody who will decide what happens to the Psychology Department. So from this, we've generated a 7 page report that is being delivered to Dr. C. MacKenzie and it reports our reactions to the different principles, puts forward our own principles, and at the same time looks at various scenarios that seem likely to be considered, although there may be others, and talks about practical implications of these for us. At this point we're trying very hard not to fixate on any particular solution. Most of the Department has been very cooperative in not trying to put forward any personal agenda which hampers their credibility but people are saying things like: "At this moment what's useful for me is to be near the Biology Department because I collaborate with the Biology Department". Or, "I do research which involves lots of elderly people, therefore I cannot have my lab and office on the eleventh floor of the Hall Building, that's not going to work for my study". These are the things, information, that we're closest to and we think are appropriate for us to bring forward. I went from our Department to see Dr. Catherine Mackenzie before this was put together - to have an informal discussion and I was very pleased to hear from her that nothing has been set in stone - and I just accepted that. And I think that's the only appropriate basis on which to operate. She pointed out again that the scenario that was published in the Thursday Report was simply an exercise to see whether it was theoretically possible to consolidate the university. I have questions about that particular scenario, I simply don't like it, personally. There are some errors, in fact, in the calculation of space concerning Psychology. What we're concerned with is practical matters and how they affect the Psychology Department. Now, on some of the issues that have been raised here today - the interdisciplinarity affects us a great deal. Our Department is very interdisciplinary, internally and one of the problems we've had, is fostering collaboration among our own Department members because we're fragmented across the university. There's 44 of us, in three different buildings, on two campuses, which leaves us quite uncomfortable. At the same time many of us have collaborations established with other Departments on the two campuses. So it's not clear to us what is the right direction. We would like to be together in one place so we may have more collaboration within the Department but at the same time we don't want to lose our links with other Departments. On the issue of clientele (we had a very long discussion on that issue), the vast majority felt that this is a non-issue. When we go out to the CEGEPs to recruit people for Psychology nobody asks us, "which campus will I have to study on?" It does not seem important to them. Once they're here, they accommodate their lives to wherever they have to study. Students will come to study Psychology wherever we happen to be because they want to study Psychology. And if someone doesn't want to study Psychology because they're on the wrong campus - we're not really interested in that - we want people interested in the discipline. I would say the approach in our Department is not to wait to be asked whether we like this, that or the other thing, but to go and tell people what it is we need. Most of the information is available to us. I think it's possible for any Department to do that. I think that's the right way to go - to get the practical information out on the table, state the principles that affect you. Then the next stage in this whole process would be for someone to try to get a larger picture given all the inputs from the different Departments. It's



very complicated. I don't think any one person, at this stage, could provide an answer.

**DR. TAYLOR:** It's a pleasure to follow up Prof. Segalowitz's refreshing perspective. I think, agreeing as well with Prof. Knitter, that once we're able to get down to practical details and knowing something about a process and where we can gain information and give responses on that level will be helpful. I will be representing the Simone de Beauvoir Institute here today. The timing of this has not permitted us as an Institute to really come together at a gathering to present a position and a thoughtful one. So I'm heartened to find out the process is not at an end. And I suspect that at the Institute we will be doing that. And hopefully we'll be doing it in very concrete and practical terms. Not having had that kind of discussion, I need to observe that people who have responded from the Institute have responded negatively to the move. It occurs to me that one of the dimensions of consideration, well, there are two actually - one has been made about the units that do draw students from a variety of different Faculties. Women's Studies often obtains its students from other academic units. We really need to examine where the critical masses of those students are coming from. And that needs to be part of the consideration. Without having done that in a detailed way, there's some indication clearly, that at the moment the downtown campus is a better one for that. The second point, that hasn't been raised, is that there are academic units in Arts and Science which have a very powerful interface with the Montreal community. All Departments have powerful, external relationships, often to Professional Associations, and so on. I think it's true to say that the Institute has been as strong as it has been for Concordia because of its very strong connection with womens' groups and other institutions on an ongoing basis, programmatically. And the downtown location has been extremely helpful to that. Just as recently as a couple of weeks ago, I was at a panel that Marian Ainley was leading and there were two sets of participants - and this is typical - there were people from UQAM, McGill and so on. There's a very strong and vital connection which would be made more difficult by a distance. And we should also look at it in terms of how the Institute - what the strengths are for Concordia of that. It seems to me that people outside the Institute and Concordia need to be concerned to what extent a relocation of the unit is going to make more difficult the job that it's doing for the university. And the external interface that the Institute has would be one that Concordia doesn't want to lose. Twelve years ago when I came to Concordia, the Institute was more well known by people that I talked to than Concordia itself, across the country and internationally. So this is the type of thing that we really want, as a university, to be concerned with, not destroying or deteriorating that kind of strength.

**DR. POIRIER:** As you know, our Department has taken a position - Political Science is opposed to this merger. For the same reasons I've heard today - they have been sifted and resifted again. I am struck by the abstractness of the debate and that's largely a function of the fact that we don't have any solid information to go on. I was wondering if we will receive this information that will allow us to come to some sort of decision. That's the first question I have. And secondly have you yourself seen any kind of information as to how this change might affect the Departments, especially the student bodies of the Departments.

DEAN BERTRAND: My understanding is that the office of the V/R Services is preparing a number of documents based on studies of the questions raised here and once they get those prepared, I presume that they will be available to any and all who are interested. In answer to your second question, I think that...I'm a bit bemused at the attitude that somehow...talking about the principles is an abstract thing that leads us nowhere. I have a problem with that in that one of the fundamental ideas proposed in the document is that we should try to put like disciplines near each other, that we should try to move and consolidate those Departments that are currently divided on the two campuses, and so forth. The Steering Committee called this meeting at the request of a number of members of Council who wanted to discuss (I thought) those issues. I've heard a number of reasons why...and I've read a report from the Political Science Department, why they don't want to move. They're not terribly compelling in an academic sense. They're compelling only in the "I don't want to move because it's not fun to move" sense and I know that - I've moved a few times in my life too. And we're trying to get this debate on another level and discover whether there are academic reasons for accepting this plan or whether there are good academic reasons for saying "hey, we'd rather do this" in terms of the Faculty of Arts and Science - for the following reasons. And I will only point out that I don't think it helps anyone to continue this debate any longer on the idea that, "we don't want to move because we don't want to move plane". That's not going to wash very well at all. We need to come up with explanations that are academic as to why whatever Arts and Science wants out of it is not something that was cobbled together at all but out of a reality, that is - probably for the last time in the foreseeable future we've got new space available. And I thought it was a pretty good idea that somebody in the university sat down and said "let's see what we can do now that we have an opportunity". And I thank Dr. Segalowitz for pointing out for me, with all due respect to the students who are currently here, had we held a vote on the merger of Loyola and Sir George in 1973, I'll guarantee you the students would have voted against it on both campuses. Students are here and they're accustomed to where they are and that's understandable and I have no quarrel with that. All the indications from the new students coming in are "that won't matter". So the students that are here aren't a good barometer. In fact, neither are the faculty, in a sense, as much as the new faculty coming in. It took us ten years to get over the fact that we had Sir George Williams students and Loyola students. That's a dead issue now - we have Concordia students. We have mostly Concordia faculty. But of course those of us who are getting older, still have a certain attachment to other campuses and that's not going to go away. But the reality of the situation is, we have a good many Concordia professors. So all I'm urging all of you to do is get rid of that baggage and that argument and think about academic reasons for whatever it is your Department thinks is best academically. And then I'm certainly willing to look at all of those and I'm sure that Charles Giguere, Catherine MacKenzie, the five hard-working faculty members on that Committee, the students that are going to be added - all of those people will also be willing to look at it. But I don't think they're going to be terribly willing to look at an argument that says, "I don't want to move because I don't want to move".

DR. DECARIE: Well I so much want to be part of the solution but during the last few minutes I've become, I think, part of the problem. It would seem to me that in the best of all possible worlds we would be discussing the space implications of academic problems. And I'm willing

to recognize that we don't live in the best of all possible worlds and we do have to face realities but to sit here and discuss the academic implications of a space problem is turning the matter on its head. And moreover we're being drawn into a false position to pretend that what we are dealing with is not a space document but its a document of educational philosophy which it patently is not. And that makes me very unwilling to continue with a debate in which we discuss the academic validity of the ideas put forward in this document because there are no academic ideas put forward. What we are doing instead - sometimes rightly, sometimes wrongly, - is defending what exists because there is nothing there to put against it. And since the essential problem clearly is one of space and I recognize the problem and I recognize that there may be creative possibilities posed by this space and I think that there are - the directions for how to use it should not come from Vice-Rector, Services, it should come from people within the academic stream. And we should be made aware of these wonderful possibilities so we can make proposals. But I must return to a question which is one the Chairman has not answered. And that is -undoubtedly the most lavish user and the most lavish duplicator of space in this university is the administration. The possible exception is Athletics (though at least they don't duplicate), and I would dearly love to know why synergy and collegiality are not things which would benefit our administration but would benefit the rest of us. To discuss academic issues of the space problems is putting it on its head. There are no academic ideas in this document. Since the essential problem is one of space and there may be creative ways to use the space we should let them know.

DEAN BERTRAND: Is that a question?

DR. DECARIE: Yes.

DEAN BERTRAND: Again I'm the wrong person to ask. Believe it or not, I'm not the administration. I'm one member of the administration. However it seems to me quite permissible for this Council (as one suggestion out of a lot of others), to suggest that one way to do things is to move Bishops Court out to Loyola for reasons that will then become apparent because there will be academic reasons for occupying the space vacated. Now I don't know how many heart attacks that would cause. I won't have one - I moved the main office the Dean of Arts and Science out here, so it won't bother me at all. Well, I'm not so sure of that. I'm not so sure how close I really want to be to...never mind. On the other side of the coin, it has to be done within the context of an overall strategic space plan promoted by the Council. It's not just enough again to say: How come the administration doesn't move to Loyola? - there has to be some context in that particular set of discussions. And I'm quite willing to have the Council discuss that in part - along with other issues that are raised.

DR. BYERS: Mathematics had a Departmental meeting on this question on Monday and so I will just give a quick report to Council. I totally despair to say that the problem in Mathematics is indeed one of space and that looking at it in the context of this report is to skew the discussion a little. I guess the key point that came to me from the discussion was that the consolidation of the Department on one campus was not the highest priority for Mathematics and there were many other factors, many other potential principles which could be applied to this situation. It's



interesting to look at the case of Mathematics - it's a very large Department. It interacts on a research level with many different kinds of Departments and a number of those Departments are located downtown exclusively. Some would be located at Loyola if this present plan were to go through. I think a major principle for us would be to have proximity to those disciplines and those students who are interested in taking Mathematics. I guess if we're discussing principles that we should be taking some issue with the process of isolating this administrative recommendation for consolidation of Departments as the highest possible recommendation and allowing it to follow from that. Let me just say that the way I feel, as to how this report affects Arts and Science - that a major concern for me is the isolation of the two components of Arts and Science from one another. There is certainly an academic principle there and I think a very crucial one for the future of Arts and Science and the future of the University. Implicit in the reasoning behind this particular space plan is, in my opinion, a blueprint for the future development of the University. It may not have been considered that way but the implications are there. I think it's an unhealthy development to have a downtown campus with Science and Engineering, dominated by Engineering and Commerce, the applied fields, technological fields, and for whatever reason, isolate the Humanities on the Loyola campus. I was hoping that this Council would at some time in the future finally come forward with a curricular proposal which would enforce breadth. Have Humanities students take Math and Science courses and have Science students take Humanities courses. If that ever happens I would like my Department to be there - to have access to all the groups of students that come to Concordia. And I would seriously worry about any plan which would prevent us from doing that or would even have implications that would tend to isolate us from major groups of students in the University.

DEAN BERTRAND: The Curriculum Committee is currently considering a proposal which I hope will come to Council either later in May or perhaps early in September; I won't put any deadline on Vice Dean Stevens at this particular time. That's certainly in the works and we will see how Council deals with that when it happens. For my edification and the edification of Council can I just make sure that if I understood you, one possibility you're suggesting that Arts and Science think of, is perhaps consolidation of most Departments but not necessarily that they would be Humanities on one campus and Social Science on the other but rather a mix. And that you're making, as I understood it, an academic argument that Math is a discipline that bridges so much of what goes on in Arts and Science that in fact we ought to make a special case for Math by saying: That discipline should operate on both campuses because of its wide range in terms of its discipline?

DR. BYERS: Well, I'm following Bill Knitter's principle. I'm talking from the particular to the general. And the particular that I'm familiar with is Mathematics. It's not clear to me that our situation will apply for each and every Department at this university. We have a particular situation and for us a logic to being represented on both campuses. Consolidation is attractive for certain reasons, for Mathematics, but then we sat down and looked at the pros and cons and decided that the principle that I mentioned was more important to us than consolidation.

DR. OPPENHEIM: I find it difficult to say a lot at this time. The reason is because we're in a strange place in this process. In many ways what you're going to say is dependent on when



you say it. There's a lot of frustration among us in trying to address principles and suggesting that that's all we can talk about, when in fact there is a very specific statement or proposal on the boards. It's hard to talk about principles when many Departments see an axe over their heads in terms of making them move from one place to the other. And they have fears and concerns about the move. So on one hand it is difficult to talk about those kinds of principles. I have a vision of the faculty of Arts and Science where things are done out of consensus. That is to say, that you have a process or processes where things are discussed in principle, where some kind of consensus view emerges and then you, after that point, begin to talk about the practical. But the problem is, if the practical starts right at the beginning, then these fears and concerns colour over discussion of the principles. I'm an academic, most of us are academics. We are trained to look at an issue and to look at least four or five sides of it. I can almost in any of these A, B, C, D, letters - I can take any position very well and I can argue for it. What determines the position you take? In some sense it's emotions and it's feelings, it's disappointments and it's the particular that determines your position on any of these principles. My Department expressed a great deal of anxiety. The anxiety was first in terms of the vision of the Faculty of Arts and Science. We had a fear that the heavy research Departments, particularly those that get outside grants will be put in one place, and those that are not in areas that get outside grants will be more or less put in the other place. I think we have a fear that Humanities and soft Social Sciences will be isolated on one campus and on the other hand the professional schools and the hard Sciences will be isolated on the other. Is it hard to address the principle of whether it's important for like to be next to like. It's very hard to decide that. Is it more important that Religion be next to Anthropology or is it more important that the Simone de Beauvoir Institute connects to Engineering or that Religion or Philosophy be next to Commerce? That's hard to address. In my own Department, for example, we have one of our professors who teaches Business Ethics in Commerce. In some ways it is more important for Commerce to be next to Religion and it's important for Engineering to be next to the Humanities than it is for Philosophy to be next to Anthropology (although I've always thought that was an interesting thing). So what I'm saying is, it's difficult to address the principles with the specific plan down and our deep kinds of fears and concerns already there. In terms of the library, the Department has a fear and a deep disappointment - after going to that incredible Norris Building for so long. Every week I would look at the construction and count how many floors - I was excited. To think that after all of that, all of a sudden, you will be miles away. It is not a principle but it's a feeling that it's important for a particular Department to be next to the major library and we cannot believe that the books and monographs that are important to Religion and the cognate areas can all be collected here at Loyola. There's also the fear that in terms of graduate and undergraduate instruction, there has been no study of what effect moving would have on part-time students and evening students. And at least in my Department those are called people. This is more like a cry of frustration than a principle argument, but I think that the difficulty is that at this point in the process it's hard to talk about principles when you see already what's at stake. If in some sense we can reconstruct the process - a process where we can talk together - that is talk to people who make the decisions because right now we're just talking to each other, I think the fears, the emotions, the disappointments can be overcome.

DR. SASSANO: Mr. Chairman, I assure you that when I entered this room this afternoon I promised myself that I would not open my mouth. However I see that some members are mentioning Geology, and therefore when somebody mentions Geology some nerve said that they are complaining about things that happened to Geology 10 years ago. Historically, you know, Mr. Chairman, that Geology was set on two campuses 10 or 12 years ago. We were two operations. And we did not have the luxury of a report that asked us what to do. At that time we were forced to consolidate. And therefore I think I may relate some of Geology's experiences with the larger departments, the more powerful departments - because they seem to be touched in the vital spots right now. I remember when Geology was screaming murder nobody lifted a finger. Mr. Chairman, we had beautiful labs downtown which were quite good - they were more than sufficient for our needs. We had a higher enrolment, we had eight or nine full-time faculty members. Look where we are today. We are barely surviving. We have been choked and trampled on, upset, gagged - you name it. Every person who tried to present a vision of the future of the Geology Department was blackmailed, blacklisted, had his career interfered with - you name it. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the actual decline of enrolment in Geology that we experienced in the last ten years may be ascribed to a consolidation but may also be ascribed to the appointment of Dean Bertrand to the Faculty of Arts and Science. I don't know - maybe it's both, maybe it's only one of these cases. However, we know what it means to consolidate on one campus. As a senior Geologist in Saskatchewan I remember exactly the same thing. In Saskatchewan in 1971 I remember the administration told me: remove the tracks from the eighteenth level - and we did so. After six months they told us: put them back. After six months they told us: the situation has changed - take them out again. Now here we are talking about the beautiful ideas, sublime missions, anxieties of faculty - and so on. Nobody talks about cost. Geologists are people who have their feet on the ground. We know our planet - we know how much it costs to wander on this planet. Geology is slated to be moved downtown. I remember, Mr. Chair, that the cost of consolidating Geology in Loyola signified the destruction of two perfectly equipped laboratories downtown on the tenth floor. Chemical benches were removed - and so were hoods, pipelines and gaslines. They were refurbished at Loyola. Now we are slated to go downtown again - it means that we are going to destroy our laboratories at Loyola. We just finished setting up an electro-microscope laboratory (which apparently doesn't work) - and we are going to set it up downtown, Mr. Chair, again? At what cost? I know that this University - it's been published in the journals - has a deficit of \$44 million dollars. This money is not the Rector's money, it's not the Dean's money, it is the taxpayer's money. This means it is my money. And I am fed up paying taxes, Mr. Chairman. Now - is Geology (this is my question) going to become a petite patates department, a wandering department that's going to move back and forth every three or four years according to the plans of some kind of strange mission that this University never developed?

DR. LIGHTSTONE: I'd like to speak as an individual, and not as any representative of the administration, if I may. Listening to the debate here and listening to the debate in my own Department meeting, one of the things that occurred to me is that it's something like attempting a multi-variate analysis of a problem. You can establish all sorts of correlates which point in different directions in making a decision as to the causal, or in our case, the most important

factors. I think it's possible on the basis of particular experience to generate some general propositions - and then to apply them again in other particular instances. Not as rules, hard and fast, which cannot be broken in any case, but it is possible, from our experience, to come up with some general rules which might guide us. And which we might feel perfectly comfortable in advancing, in certain cases, given particular circumstances. Now I can come up with several that are important to me, many of which run parallel to and intersect the principles that are in the document. From my own experience as a researcher, I should like to be close to those persons with whom I collaborate or are most likely to collaborate. As a teacher I should like the body of my Department's courses to be given on the same campus as the courses from those Departments from which our enrolments can come. I should like my graduate students to have adequate space in order to create an appropriate academic environment for residency. And I should like to have my students near the library books they are likely to consult for research. Many of these principles accord with those in the strategic plan. Many of them complement or supplement those in the strategic plan. But the host of possible factors, and many of which I have heard today which I have not even thought of, provide different vectors to try to come to a decision about whether or not my Department should be on two campuses, one campus, this campus or that campus. I think in having to come to a decision as to which vectors are the longest or the most prevailing, these are they. And as far as I'm concerned I would move to the South Shore if these were satisfying. I think it is quite possible, therefore, Mr. Chair, to make a substantial contribution to the debate in principle on the basis of our experience with of course the provision that it would have to be translated into a workable plan for each and every particular unit in cooperation with that unit. I think that, basically, among all the host of factors a multi-variate analysis might throw into the works, these are the factors which I believe are workable.

DR. AUCHINACHIE: I know it's considered bad form to display emotion but first of all I'd like to express a little resentment at a caricature of the people who are opposed, as ossified and fossilized and locked in a position of attachment. There may be some affection for a particular place though it's like the prisoner of Shalom, the spiders become you're friends. But I do think they also have genuine reasons. I do think that you are right in saying that students become attached to what they know. And I suppose if you were to lobotomize anyone they would forget their previous personality. But I do think you are ignoring a real problem in enrolment and that has to do with part-timers and their rhythm of work and study for which the downtown campus is particularly convenient. There is a problem of transportation - the shuttle bus is only used by a minority of students - the ones who are willing to wait for it. Others make other arrangements. There has never been any indication of what the Space Committee might have meant by a better system of transportation. Do they intend to convince the city? So I do think that there is a demographic problem that hasn't been properly met. Dr. Taylor said we have to think in practical terms - though the parameters of this debate were to be somewhat abstract. But it seems to me, if we were to think in abstract terms, the Committee should have thought in practical terms and should have provided some demographic evidence that this sort of move was a logical or preferable or inevitable or somehow desirable one. The next thing I'd like to say is that Psychology's experience is interesting, and I'm sure quite valid for Psychology. But it isn't



typical. It is a large Department in which there is high competition to enter. I do believe I'm correct in saying that you can't be a part-timer in Psychology and be an Honour's student. That is not true in the English Department - we have many Honour's students who are also part-timers and we do depend a great deal on a part-time clientele. The last thing I'd like to say is that there has been surmises as to whether the Space Committee's recommendations are alterable - whether it is one scenario or not. We have heard, at least from one member of the Space Committee, that it can only be changed in small details. That it's in fact not a scenario but by and large a script which is only going to be altered in certain lines - the sense will be the same - maybe a few punctuation changes but this is the scenario script. I just want to remain sceptical about that.

DR. SEGALOWITZ: Just for the record - it is possible to be a part-time student and an Honour's student at the same time in Psychology.

DR. AUCHINACHIE: Oh, well I was misinformed.

DEAN BERTRAND: And I would point out that your ears misinformed you because you put a number of words in my mouth that never came out of my mouth. Certainly words such as fossilized.

DR. AUCHINACHIE: Well you did say they were locked in.

DR. BERTRAND: You're extrapolating and you're allowed to do that, but don't accuse me of doing that. And I do want to assure you that sceptic though you may be - this is indeed a scenario. And it is changeable in every T and I, as far as I'm concerned. Frankly I don't like everything in there and I have some ideas that I want to share with people at the appropriate time about it as well. I am convinced that what you have on paper as a scenario will never be what ends up. There will be a number of changes. So rest assured that if the English Department comes together and produces a document based on academic principles and academic vision it will be listened to, and perhaps the views of the English Department will be partially accommodated or completely accommodated - I can't foresee the future. But rest assured and please spread the good word to all your colleagues that this scenario is not cast in stone and I've never heard anyone say it's going to be just a little tinkering here and there. That's not the word I got. The word I got is that the scenario was just one example of many that they could have come up with. They came up with this one for a variety of reasons and they're totally open to other discussions. So I think if you could spread that word and take some of the concerns that Michael Oppenheim talked about - out of people's lives and bring them back to looking at the academic issues involved here - we'll all be better off.

PROFESSOR VERTHUY: I'd like to say that I also don't like the idea that there are those of us who are locked into scenarios. I think that some people can be fossilized very young, and that those of us who are becoming older are just becoming better. I would also like to state, in my



particular case, one point in the interest of the collegiality that is so popular with the committee on space. I moved out to Loyola and stayed for 2 years with the view to knitting up a certain number of differences in the French Department. And I may say that in some ways it was an interesting experience - but the students did not follow. It was very simple. The downtown students did not follow so that I found myself in the second year teaching downtown while having an office on the Loyola Campus. And so eventually, I went back down to where the bulk of the students are in the French Department. There is this constant, but lower, enrolment clientele on the Loyola Campus and a much higher one downtown. And the students were not prepared to swap campuses, particularly in the evening. I also, on the anecdotal level, would like to say that when I told some friends of mine in the French Department at McGill University that the University was thinking of moving the French Department out to Loyola they cracked up in hysterical laughter. Their enrolment is going down, and we, with one stroke of a pen, were apparently on the verge of solving their future enrolment problems for them. They thought it was a very collegial gesture indeed - but I'm not sure it's the collegiality that the Committee had in mind. Still in the same vein - on the reaction of other universities - I trust that you do know that UQAM History Department the other day passed a motion condemning any distancing of the entire Concordia History Department from it because of the necessity for Departments in different Universities to work together. You have said on several occasions today that we need more academic reasons and I have been listening to people speak. I'd like to take this opportunity to say how much I appreciated Dr. Oppenheim's intervention. But people have been giving academic reasons all the time - if these are not academic reasons I don't know what academic reasons are. Or perhaps for my enlightenment, and the enlightenment of the other people in the room, you might define some other ones. We have talked about the need for the university to have at its heart an Arts and Science Faculty. We have talked about the absolute need for the University to have students. We have talked about the absolute need for students to have access to not just their courses, but to the faculty, libraries and to an environment that includes other universities and facilities in other universities. We have talked about the kind of natural inter-disciplinarity that takes place when half the students in your courses come from other faculties and the need to maintain that. We have talked about the need to show faculty and students that women also exist. This is part of a learning process - that women are alive and well and not something that you relegate to the periphery of a university. We have talked about the need for the students in the French Department to go outside. We've done all these things - and these are apparently not academic reasons. It would be extremely interesting for us to be sent a list of acceptable academic reasons. We could ponder them and see if we could make some suggestions relative to these other academic reasons that have nothing to do with the place of Arts and Science Faculty, nothing to do with students, nothing to do with libraries, nothing to do with interdisciplinarity, nothing to do with collegiality, nothing to do with students moving around and having access to other people and other universities and so forth and so on. Also nothing to do with the topic of showing that women are an inherent part of the university and not something to be relegated to the outer ring of the universe. I would like everyone here to spare us a thought - for the loneliness of the woman scientist who's going to find very few (except for Psychology) women in Science faculty. They're lonelier than ever and one of them indeed came up to me recently and was extremely distressed at the thought of being isolated from other women in the Faculty. When you said to my colleague in the English Department

that they would be consulted every step of the way, I had a sudden flash of Czesescu consulting the peasants in Romania after he destroyed their homes and escorted them with troops all the way to their new apartment buildings. You'll excuse me if I have also geographical and historical concepts coming to my mind when I listen to what people say around me - and that frightens me. I would also like to say that there isn't unlimited time. People have to be out of the Norris building and we know that. And so it's not possible to say that there is time. Somewhere, at some point in the very near future, decisions have to be made about who's going into the new library building - because presumably when they demolish the Norris even our University won't ask the Departments to give their courses and have their offices on the debris. I would like to say that the question was asked some time ago- and has received no answer. You were asked, Dean, to go back to the Committee, and to the Vice-Rector Services, to demand that your Faculty be given all the information about space, cost, students, any market surveys that have been done, and any implications. I presume that they've been working on transportation problems and traffic flow. All this information would be made available to all the Departments and programs for which you are responsible, and all the Student Associations and faculty, if you would go back and demand that all this information be made available to us so that your faculty can have the informed input that Dr. Auchinchie mentioned earlier.

DEAN BERTRAND: Demand in the French sense, I presume. I do not demand things (in the English sense) from anyone. Nor do I think that I should take the responsibility of the faculty members upon myself. I think that faculty members and the Chairs of Departments are perfectly capable of requesting information, and they can request it from me if they wish or they can request it from the Vice-Rector directly. But I don't see why I should have to spoon-feed you and other members of the faculty. I think what I find most regrettable about your statement is your categorizing of a significant and important part of the University as the outer part of the universe. I think one of the reasons that the entire Strategic Space Plan came up is that there is an unfortunate attitude in certain quarters that this University is made up of an important campus and a secondary satellite campus. And I think it is an unfortunate attitude, that I heard you express, (and you're not the only one I've heard express that) - and I think if we could get over that particular hurdle and begin to understand that what we have are two campuses of equal importance in one university, I think we would advance this debate by leaps and bounds. And I would ask everyone at Council to have the courtesy not to make certain colleagues feel as if somehow they have been reduced to living on the outer edge, because I don't think that's a fair characterization. In fact I think that's a completely unfair characterization, and I think it should cease immediately.

DR. TAYLOR: The week that all this started happening, ironically, I was in a workshop with a colleague on public participation. And there are some principles about decision making that affect people's lives to the effect that tremendous amounts of emotion and sentiment are raised. One of the learned principles is that a process be described by how it's going to unfold quite clearly. I think that people can make decisions about looking after their own situations, presenting their own cases. A lot of the feeling of being powerless can be reduced and unnecessary anguish reduced by some clarity. Opportunities and time frames for any academic unit to get its act together before presenting its case would be tremendously helpful. And it

would remove, I think, to some extent, a lot of the emotionality. It will remove the unnecessary anguish or reduce the anguish. And perhaps it will distinguish genuine disagreements from just unfortunate occasions where someone did not understand what somebody said or did not have the opportunity to have heard information that is pertinent. I don't know how that happens from here but it would seem to me quite an important recommendation that our Faculty Council could make.

DEAN BERTRAND: I expect they may even be on that track right now. I am certainly prepared, as Chair of Council, to take forward to Dr. Mackenzie and Dr. Sheinin (as the co-chairs now of the expanded committee) the concern you have raised, because I think it's very important. And I think they're dealing with it. I have a feeling that that's part of what's going on now, but I will express that concern on the part of Council because I think that's a point very well taken.

PROF. SHULMAN: You have expressed positive support for the faculty members who have worked on the Committee, but expressed negative comments about the motivation of the people who are critical of the plan. I would like to hear you indicate some respect for those who have taken time away from their own work and their own personal interests to express their concern for the University, and at the same time for the people who have opposed the principles and the scenario emerging out of the space plan. I think that a lot of what I have heard today constitutes academic issues - sometimes stated in terms of personal expression and feeling. I think that Dr. Oppenheim's comments were essentially academic, even though they were expressed in a statement of feeling. I respect the way he communicated that. As someone who supports a downtown Humanities Arts and Science operation as well as having a Loyola presence on the same bill - let me say to you that I hate being in downtown Montreal. I would love not to have to come to downtown Montreal. It has very little cultural vision, it's ugly, there's no place to walk. It's a square array of burnt-out buildings approaching some areas of the Bronx. There's very little cultural enrichment - once a year they have more than enough to see for the rest of the year. I think there's a myth about downtown Montreal being the hub of culture. I live close to Loyola, this is the place where I use the library, which I have easier access to. Many of us would not like to be downtown in terms of residential convenience. It costs time and money for me to be downtown. Although many of us believe that it's in the interests of the students and the academic life of the University to have a downtown operation, there are those who put forward a vision of the University, rightly or wrongly, that is not simply based on self-interest.

DR. SEGALOWITZ: I normally don't comment on the tone of the debate, because I like to stay with the issue. And I don't like to get emotional about the issue - I like to stay with the facts. But I feel emotional about something that was said a short while ago, and I think I need to express myself on that. Someone referred to a process and compared it to what happened in Romania. There was previous talk in the debate where someone made reference to Stalin and Nazis. We should be more responsible than that. We should not trivialize a real tragedy. What is happening here is not a tragedy.



DR. GRAY: The characterisation of the debate has proceeded properly in complete disregard of the salient features of who the students are and what their preferences are, who the professors are and what their preferences are. What is the character of the buildings in which the operations take place? Disregard of all of these features is widely abstract. Certainly none of us as Chairs would think to design the ideal curriculum and then start looking around to see if we had the people to staff that ideal curriculum. One of the principles should be to begin with the characterisation of any university, particularly our university - which is unique. If a department is truly a university department it should be wherever or in how many places that university is - to the extent that there is life in the university throughout. This certainly exists on the Sir George and on the Loyola campuses. If it exists on the South Shore, so much the better. If it exists in the Concave, so much the better. There may be excellent reasons why that cannot take place - perhaps in a department with a very small amount of professors and students. A critical mass makes collegiality. In large departments, such as Psychology, where considerable amounts of research are done as joint projects, people need to be in touch with one another, and with the potential research significant-others. Those serve as reasons for perhaps, a centralization of such a department. What I would like to suggest as a principle of procedure, is that the burden of evidence needs to be changed. The principle which is present in the report is that the program is centralization, and the burden of evidence is on those who wish to say that should not take place. I think the proper procedure alone is to start with the assumption that the presence and dispersion of full department facilities is the proper starting point. And then the burden of evidence falls on those who wish to alter that and centralize such departments.

DR. OPPENHEIM: I just want to briefly say that I'm uneasy with personal attacks on the Chair. And I want to express confidence that the Chair, who is also the Dean, will present the views and concerns that have been expressed.

DR. HOECKER-DRYSDALE: I can't put forward, at this point, any position on the part of the Sociology Department - because we simply have not arrived at a position. We haven't had a departmental discussion yet on the whole matter. And the reason for that is this - that we have currently functioning a Planning Committee in the Department which is looking at the Department as a totality in terms of a whole range of matters such as curriculum, personnel, research facilities, where our graduate and undergraduate programs stand in relation to one another, as well as other things like libraries and so forth. And in that total context obviously space will become a matter to be taken up. And so in that sense we have started a committee of three to deal with that issue in itself, which will then relate to the Planning Committee. And the Planning Committee will also relate to other committees in the Department. In other words, we are in the process of trying to describe a planning scenario over the next five years. It seems to me that that's the appropriate context in which discussions regarding space and so forth should take place. And we may have in the future, in Council, more fruitful discussions about where we're going, what our needs are and whether we need a two campus location or not. Then Departments could present their scenarios as Psychology has already done. It seems to me Departments have responsibilities in all this. It's terribly one-sided, not to mention uncollegial,



to throw everything at the administration - not only for the question and the answers but to provide the information and so forth. The fact is that the Departments can generate their own information in order to work out their own scenarios. They can set their own goals and priorities. They can set their own plans and they can make their own recommendations to the Dean and the administration regarding their needs and purposes. And most Departments probably are in the process of doing that. I wanted to let you know that the Department of Sociology is in the process of doing that, and because it is in the process of doing that we have not taken any stand in the Department on this. A petition was sent to me yesterday announcing that four hundred and something students, faculty and staff in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, have decided that everything has to be retracted and they demand not to go anywhere. That petition is totally unofficial. The Department Chairman or any faculty I have talked to don't know where it came from. And yet it was sent out from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. It has no official standing at all in the Department. I think there are different ways of reacting to this, and one of the ways is to begin to look at what one's own Department is doing, needs to be doing, wants to be doing in the future, and then respond on that basis.

DR. WHITE: I'd like to second what Dr. Drysdale just said and make another point that explains some of the background of this issue. In the first place, the departments can do a lot for themselves. It's just that certain departments have had much greater necessity to do so in the past, and are perhaps better equipped to do so now because of that experience. I think the Science Departments, Psychology in particular, and some other Departments which have had moves within the last five years, have become acquainted with the space planning process, the budget norms for space, and a lot of the other procedures that go into acquiring and retaining adequate space for a department's activities. I think that as some other departments become more familiar with the process some of the mysticism will disappear and it will become more possible for the departments to get what they need out of upcoming moves. Another aspect of this space change that may be in the opting is that the addition of a new library has created, for the first time in many years, a temporary overflow of space within which some departments can be put while other renovations are being made. Now one of the things that has stymied the Psychology Department (of which I am most familiar) and perhaps some other Departments in the past, is that there have been many cases where mutual exchanges of space would have been acceptable to both departments but couldn't have been made. The addition of a new building has created a temporary overflow space where a Department can be put while renovations are being made. I would hope that the Planning Department, or people involved in the planning process who have been intimately aware of any of these problems and difficulties in the past, have realized that this is an opportunity to address some of these problems. In the near future we won't have this opportunity again - that is, to have new space into which some people can move while other space is renovated to solve problems.

MR. J. SERRUYA: I'd like to say that I am a little disappointed in the tone of this discussion. I'm very surprised and upset and I don't find that arguments against the Chair or the Committee have any place in this discussion. I'd also like to point out that the students have made a request that the Chair go to the Committee and ask the members to make available all the information.

The Chair responded that it's not his responsibility - it's ours. However students have made a request, at that meeting with Dr. MacKenzie, for information - but we have only received copies of letters sent to the Committee expressing disgust with the report. So I'd like to reiterate that request - that the Chair go to the Committee and ask for the information - because we have made some representation and nothing has been done. Also, something coming up for discussion at Senate is the university mission statement - which is something that could be very contentious. However, I believe that the main idea of the mission statement is that the University fosters critical thinking. I think it's brilliant as a mission of the University. However I'm not sure how well that goal can be accomplished with the segregation of faculties. In order to foster critical thinking there has to be a healthy amount of student interaction - students from different faculties talking to each other either after class or in the cafeteria, etc. Also necessary is professor-student interaction, which also may not be available if students and professors are separated on different campuses.

DEAN BERTRAND: What I will do is contact Dr. Catherine MacKenzie. I have no idea where the information you're talking about is. That is, I don't know how far along they are in putting it together. I expect to receive whatever they have and I will certainly urge her to make sure the Student Associations receive that and I think the Chair of every Department and Principal of every College should receive the documentation as well. We've been going now for about two hours and I think that I'm about ready to close this meeting. Do you have something new to add Professor Brian?

PROF. BRIAN: I've got a couple of corrections that I want to add. CEGEP students may be happy to go to either campus, but let's not forget the part-time students. My Chair reported what was going on in Math. I was at that meeting. I don't remember saying we recognized there were some departments that had to consolidate in one place because of their laboratory needs. I don't remember us ever saying anything to the effect that many departments could consolidate out here. It seems to me you were saying that Math was special, and therefore entitled to being on two campuses, whereas others are not. That was not the tenor of what was said in the Math Department meeting. Also, your summing up of what M. Verthuy said was at variance with what she remembers saying. Are you going to give her a chance to repeat what she said or are you accepting that the record will set it straight?

DEAN BERTRAND: I, frankly, don't know what you're talking about, to be very honest.

PROF. BRIAN: You summed up what Professor Verthuy said. She objected to some of it, saying: "That is not what I said". She wanted to correct the record at that point.

DEAN BERTRAND: We'll look at the record and see if we find a major discrepancy. I think that, contrary to what some people may feel, this was actually a very useful exercise. It certainly was for me. I will tell you in response, Dr. Gray, that it has been my experience in six years as Dean that the major thrust has always been departments wanting to consolidate on one campus or the other. That has been what's happened over the past six years. Naturally, I looked at that and from my own experience perceived that for most departments (the Science Departments,

Modern Languages, Psychology) that this was probably a good idea. You have suggested that perhaps we should start from the other way around. I am quite willing to look at it from that way around as well. And I think that we can have another meeting a little bit later on - that is, when there is another report from the expanded Space Committee. In the meantime, I anticipate that the Departments and Colleges and so forth, will all be working on their own responses to say whatever it is that they want to say, in an academic vein. And I would like all of you to go away with another, I suppose, partial answer to the question posed by Professor Shulman. You've known me for a long time - you know I don't mind at all if people disagree. That's what universities are all about - a certain creative tension and so forth. I do not like it when people refuse to accept that other people have good intentions and are simply proposing ideas that other people may or may not like. I appreciate Norm Segalowitz's comment - I've been hurt and stunned by the trivialization of such things as the Holocaust by relating these events to something as simple as a space plan for Concordia University. I'm also disturbed by the attitude that because every possible point wasn't covered in this document that somehow the university and the committee would never think of it. I'll give you an example. Of course it was clear to all the members of the Committee, as it was apparent to me from the moment I read this report, that if the transportation system between campuses is not improved this whole plan falls apart. That's self evident. And why some people should assume that somehow nobody thought that the shuttle bus system will have to be upgraded, that no one thought that in fact we'll have to approach the city and ask them to extend the 24 bus route to the Loyola Campus, and a number of other factors like that - kind of astonishes me. Because what we had were six, I think, good hard-working people at the forum on this campus a few weeks ago who came up with a plan. We can disagree with the plan and we can talk about alternatives to the plan. But to make it sound as if this was part of some nefarious plot on the part of good people - I don't think that's productive at all. And if that's what you took to be my criticism of some of the critique - you're right. I don't mind people disagreeing. Disagree with reasons, disagree with academic scenarios and so forth - but not on that level because that doesn't get us anywhere. And I think we have gone beyond that today. I appreciate, Michael, some of your comments about the emotional impact and so forth. And I think we have moved a level ahead and that's important - because I think Council members can now go back and spread a positive message which is: There are opportunities here. And each Department has an opportunity now to build a new future - which may or may not look very different from what the present is. That's for the Department to determine, and then for the rest of us to sit down and say: Will that fit into the overall philosophy that we are trying to develop? So I am actually heartened by the debate and the discussion. We will debate this again in Council and we will, I expect, have discussions in Departments. I am willing to come to any Department or College at any time to discuss whatever issues they wish. Thank you all very much.